

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 were rejected in the above-identified Office Action. Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended, claims 22-24 have been cancelled, and claim 25 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-21 and 25 are pending in the application.

AMENDMENTS

Support for the amendments to claims 1, 11, and 21 may be found at least on page 5, lines 15-19, page 14, line 1 through page 15, line 2, and in Figure 2. Support for new claim 25 may be found at least on page 14, lines 17-23.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §101

In “Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101,” item 3 on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 21-24 are rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicants have cancelled claims 22-24, obviating their rejections

In rejecting claim 21, the Examiner states that the “means for” recited by claim 21 are software entities and that Applicants’ Specification lacks enabling disclosure for hardware to support realization of the software functionalities. In response, Applicants respectfully draw the Examiner’s attention to Figure 5 and page 16, lines 1-19, which illustrate and describe “a computer system suitable for use to practice the present invention, in accordance with one embodiment”, the computer system including “one or more processors 502 and system memory 504 ... [and] mass storage devices 506 (such as diskette, hard drive, CDROM and so forth).” More particularly, “system memory 504 and mass storage 506 are employed to store a working copy and a permanent copy of the programming instructions implementing the x-sheet data processing specifications, and their execution analyzer and engine.” Thus, Applicants’ Specification does disclose hardware to store and execute the programming instructions for implementing the recited functions. Because claim 21 is a means plus function claim governed by 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph, the claim should be interpreted to include “the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof”. As stated, Applicants’ Specification recites structure which includes

storage for storing instructions for implementing the functions recited by claim 21. Accordingly, claim 21 is statutory subject matter under §101.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112,” item 5 on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 22-24 have been rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement by 35 U.S.C. § 112 para 1. In response, Applicants have cancelled claims 22-24, obviating the rejections.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102,” item 7 on page 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-6, 8-16, and 18-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is being anticipated by *Renner et al.*, U.S. Patent Number 6,993,657 (hereinafter “Renner”).

In response, Applicants first note that claims 22-24 are cancelled, obviating their rejections.

Further in response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, and 21 to recite “generating one or more execution flow descriptions to document the execution order of said actions/computations based on results of the determination”, overcoming the Examiner’s rejections of those claims. While Applicants also believe that Renner fails to teach or suggest at least the “analyzing” recited by claims 1, 11, and 21, Applicants nonetheless offer the enclosed amendment to further prosecution and reduce the issues of contention between Applicants and the Examiner.

In the passages cited by the Examiner, Renner simply teaches a community server adapted to provide access and management of one or more databases to a connected and authorized user (see Renner, Abstract). The community server of Renner may provide the access and management facilities to users by sending HTML web pages to the users’ browsers. As is shown in Tables 2 and 4 of Renner, these HTML web pages can be

constructed by applying eXtensible Stylesheet Language Translation (XSLT) files to XML components. Thus, the database interface may be specified in XML, or the database may answer queries in XML, and the community server of Renner may apply XSLT files to such XML components to generate HTML web pages to send to user browsers, as is known in the art.

Nowhere in Renner does one find any analysis of cell specifications for the purpose of determining execution order of those cell specifications and their actions/computations or generation of execution flow descriptions to document the determined execution order. Further, Renner does not teach analysis of the specification occurring first and execution occurring only after the analysis has completed. Rather, in Renner, analysis and execution of the XSLT are simultaneous; the order in which XSLT statements are processed is the order in which they are specified. Thus, there is no need in Renner to generate execution flow descriptions to document execution order because the received specification (XSLTs) already do this.

Further, by processing XSLT statements in the order they occur, Renner teaches away from modifying Renner to determine execution order or generate any sort of execution flow descriptions. Since the received specifications themselves specify the execution order, one skilled in the order would not think to modify the system of Renner to determine any sort of execution order or to generate descriptions to document such an order.

The Examiner argues on pages 12-13 of the Office Action that the “claim does not provide sufficient details regarding how an action being determined when processing a first cell is stored and then using the storage structure to address the processing order subsequent to the first cell determination.” In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, and 21 to recite the manner of analysis and execution in greater detail. As amended, the specification is first analyzed to determine execution order and execution flow descriptions are generated to document the determined order. Then, after completion of the analysis of the specification, the specification is executed based on the execution flow descriptions.

Further on pages 12-13, the Examiner describes the manner of analysis and execution of Renner in greater detail. According to the Examiner, XSLT statements are prosecuted until a statement is found that references a “missing value”. The context/memory address is saved, the missing value is found, and processing continues from the saved location. But even assuming the Examiner’s characterization of Renner’s teachings is correct, Renner still fails to disclose in as exact of detail as is claimed the effectuating of data processing only after analysis and generating have completed.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Renner under §102. Claims 11 and 21 recite limitations similar to those of claim 1, and accordingly are patentable over Renner for at least the same reasons.

Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-16, and 18-20 depend on either claim 1 or 11, incorporating their limitations respectively. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-16, and 18-20 are patentable over the Renner under §102.

Further, nothing in Renner teaches or suggests the recitations of claim 25: “wherein the execution flow descriptions comprise interdependency information represented by a directed graph”. Renner does not disclose any sort of execution flow descriptions, much less descriptions comprising “interdependency information represented by a directed graph”. As described above, such descriptions, information and graph are unnecessary because specification analysis and execution are simultaneous in Renner. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 is patentable over Renner.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” item 8 on page 13 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 7 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Renner* as applied to claims 1 and 11 in view of W3C publications “XML Path Language (XPath) Version 1.0” (hereinafter “XPath”) and “XSL Transformations (XSLT) Version 1.0” (hereinafter “XSLT”) that are purportedly stable documents published as W3C recommendations on 16 November 1999. For at least the reasons previously provided, Applicants respectfully disagree.

XPath and XSLT, alone or in combination, do not remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of *Renner*. Therefore, claims 1 and 11 remain patentable over *Renner*, XPath, and XSLT, alone or in combination, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 7 and 17 depend on claims 1 and 11, incorporating their limitations respectively. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, Claims 7 and 17 are patentable over *Renner*, XPath, and XSLT, alone or in combination, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-21 and 25 are solicited. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1513. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: April 29, 2008

by: /Robert C. Peck/
Robert C. Peck
Reg. No.: 56,826

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97222
Telephone: 503-222-9981